

10/783,140

- 6 -

133113-2

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application and entry of the amendment are respectfully requested. Claims 1 to 26 are currently pending, and no claims have been amended.

The Office Action mailed February 2, 2005 addressed claims 1 to 26. Claims 6 to 10, 12 to 16 and 20 to 24 were objected to and claims 1 to 5, 11, 17 to 19, 25 and 26 were rejected.

Claims 1 to 5, 11, 17 to 19, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 6,727,302. The Examiner stated that with regard to claims 1 and 17, the reference discloses a transparent, fire resistant polycarbonate composition and articles made therefrom comprising polycarbonate, poly(methylphenylsiloxane) and a salt based flame retardant, and these compositions can attain UL94 V0 ratings at 1.6 millimeter thickness. The Examiner further stated that with regard to claims 11 and 18, the reference defines transparent as having a percent transmission of about 85 and a haze value of about 5 when measured according to ASTM D1003 at a thickness of 3.2 mm, and the transparent polycarbonate composition preferably has a percent transmission of about 90 and a haze value of about 2. The Examiner further noted that with regard to claims 2 to 4, the reference discloses that poly(methylphenylsiloxane) does not affect the optical properties of polycarbonate compositions, and when used in combination with a salt based flame retardant, such as KSS or Rimar salt, the resulting transparent composition is flame retardant. The Examiner further stated that with regard to claims 5 and 19, the reference discloses Applicants' "visual effects additive" and various other additives which impart "visual effects" on the composition, and combinations of the additives may be used.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner and submit that the claims are not anticipated by the reference. Applicants respectfully submit that the reference discloses transparent fire resistant polycarbonate, but the reference does not disclose translucent fire resistant polycarbonate. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the reference does not disclose a matrix of a polycarbonate polymer in which are

10/783,140

- 7 -

133113-2

embedded polysiloxane domains with an average domain size between 20 and 45 nanometers, as claimed in Applicants' claims 1 and 5. Claims 2 to 4 and 25 depend from claim 1, and are therefore also not anticipated by the reference. Applicants respectfully submit that the reference also does not disclose the limitations of claims 11, 18 and 26 because the reference fails to disclose a first polycarbonate/poly(diorganosiloxane) copolymer having a first light transmittance and a first haze and a second polycarbonate/poly(diorganosiloxane) copolymer having a second light transmittance and a second haze, wherein the first haze and the second haze have an absolute difference of at least about 50 and/or wherein the first light transmittance and the second light transmittance have an absolute difference of at least about 10 % (claim 11); a first polycarbonate/poly(diorganosiloxane) copolymer having a first light transmittance of 0 to about 55% and a first haze from about 45 to about 104 and a second polycarbonate/poly(diorganosiloxane) copolymer having a second light transmittance of about 55 to about 100% and a second haze of 0 to about 45 wherein the first haze does not equal the second haze and/or wherein the first light transmittance does not equal the second light transmittance (claim 18); or a first polycarbonate/poly(diorganosiloxane copolymer) having a first light transmittance and a first haze with a second polycarbonate/poly(diorganosiloxane) copolymer having a second light transmittance and a second haze, wherein the first haze is not equal to the second haze and/or the first light transmittance is not equal to the second light transmittance and the composition has a light transmittance of about 25 to about 85% and a haze less than about 104 (claim 26). Claim 17 depends from claim 11 and claim 19 depends from claim 18, therefore claims 17 and 19 are not anticipated for the reasons above. Since the reference does not teach each and every element of Applicants' invention, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1 to 5, 11, 17 to 19, 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

10/783,140

- 8 -

133113-2

Claims 6 to 10, 12 to 16 and 20 to 24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10 and 12 are independent claims, and claims 13 to 16 depend from claim 12. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10 and 12 to 16 are allowable. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6 to 9 depend, or ultimately depend, from claim 5, and 20 to 24 depend, or ultimately depend from claim 18, and are also allowable for the reasons previously discussed regarding claims 5 and 18. For the Examiner's convenience, a complete listing of the claims is included with this response.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6 to 10, 12 to 16 and 20 to 24 are in condition for allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the objection of claims 6 to 10, 12 to 16 and 20 to 24 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney if it is deemed that a telephone conversation will hasten prosecution of the application.

#### CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of each of the presently objected and rejected claims, claims 1 to 26. Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1 to 26, the claims currently pending.

Respectfully submitted:  
ROBERT W. VENDERBOSCH ET AL.

GENERAL ELECTRIC CO  
One Plastics Avenue  
Pittsfield, MA 01201  
March 10, 2005

By Michelle Bugbee  
Michelle Bugbee  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 42,370  
Telephone No. (413) 448-7208